

STATE OF CONNECTICUT OFFICE OF POLICY AND MANAGEMENT

February 22, 2011

This is in response to the comments you submitted concerning the proposed transfer of the Seaside Regional Center.

As you are aware, the State is in the process of selling the former Seaside Regional Center (Seaside) which is located on Shore Road in Waterford and as such the Department of Public Works (DPW), in accordance with CGS 4b-47, placed the required public notice in the *Environmental Monitor* and the public was afforded the opportunity to comment upon the proposed transfer of this property.

No Identified State Reuse

In January 2008, the State solicited reuse proposals from State agencies for the Seaside property. One agency, the Department of Public Safety, did submit a reuse proposal to utilize a structure on the property; however, that request was denied by this office. The Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) comments indicate that DEP is currently working with DPW to transfer a Conservation and Public Recreation Easement on the subject property to the DEP. When the property is sold, the easement would assure public access to the entire waterfront portion of the site in perpetuity.

Determination of Current Market Value

To determine the current market value of the Seaside property, DPW obtained two (2) independent appraisals. The \$8 million purchase price exceeds the current market value for the property as established by these appraisals.

Town of Waterford's Establishment of the Seaside Preservation Zoning District

Since the State does not establish local zoning, the type and density of any future development on the property will be subject to the local zoning laws which have been established, and will be enforced, by the Town of Waterford.

Public Access, Open Space and Recreation

Prior to disposition of the property, the Conservation and Public Recreation Easement will ensure public access to Long Island Sound for passive recreation in perpetuity. The easement area will include the entire length of waterfront, all land within the 500-year flood zone, some adjacent upland area and access from Shore Road. Dedicated public parking and appropriate signage will be provided. The DEP will determine allowed and prohibited uses within the easement area as well as hours of operation.

In addition, the Seaside Preservation Zoning District, Section 17a.11 of the Town's zoning regulations states that "All areas not approved for development as defined shall be set aside as permanent open space or recreation area in perpetuity to be held in common by the owners within the district.

Connecticut Environmental Policy Act

After granting of the easement, the property is being conveyed in "as is condition." Therefore, the transaction is not considered to be a state action that would trigger the preparation of an Environmental Impact Evaluation pursuant to CEPA.

Natural Resource Inventory

The conservation easement area, which includes the entire waterfront and most of an existing watercourse, will protect any significant ecological resources on the property. The balance of the property is essentially developed, with lawns and buildings.

Site Plan Approvals

With regard to site plan approvals, Section 17a.12 of the Town zoning regulations states that "A site plan shall be submitted to the Commission in accordance with the provisions of Section 22 of these regulations and the purpose of this district, and no building or structure, parking lot, or outdoor use of land shall be used, constructed, enlarged, or moved until said site plan has been approved by the Commission. The development shall be constructed in accordance with these Regulations and the site plan as approved by the Commission. Changes to the approved plans may be made, the extent of which shall be set forth in the special permit."

In addition, as part of local planning and zoning approvals, the Coastal Site Plan Review requirements of sections 22a-105 through 22a-110 of the Connecticut Coastal Management Act would be applicable.

Development & Design

The design of any development of Seaside will be guided by Section 17a.13 of the Town zoning regulations which states "The architectural and site design of all buildings and improvements within the Seaside Preservation District, including typical floor plans and building elevations drawn to scale showing the exterior materials and treatment to be used, shall be submitted. The Plan submission shall specifically show how the development will result in the preservation and re-use of the Main Building, Employee Building I, the Duplex and the Superintendent's House, how the principal use if to be primarily located in these buildings and how all new construction will be integrated into a cohesive and unified development plan. The development shall be constructed in accordance with these design plans and the special permit shall specify the manner in which any changes to the design elements may be made."

Department of Public Works Request for Proposal (RFP) Process

The RFP for the sale of Seaside was conducted by the DPW and the disclosure of any information concerning the RFP process at this time shall be subject to applicable State law or regulation.

Council on Environmental Quality

Requests related to suggested actions which should be undertaken by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) should be sent directly to CEQ which can be reached at (860) 424-4000 or www.ct.gov/ceq

Subdivision of the Property

With regard to suggestions that the Seaside property be subdivided; it is the State's intent and desire to sell the Seaside property as a single parcel.

Harkness Memorial State Park

Comments concerning the operation of Harkness Memorial State Park should be directed to the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). DEP can be reached at (860) 424-3000 or www.ct.gov/dep

Leasing of the Property

It is the intent and desire of the State to sell the Seaside property.

Public Informational Meetings

The disposition of the Seaside property is being conducted by the DPW in accordance with all applicable statutes, including Connecticut General Statute 4b-21 which does not include a public informational meeting requirement.

Alternative Proposals

With regard to suggestions for various alternative proposals; as the DPW's RFP process has concluded no alternative proposals are being solicited.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Barnes

Secretary

O'Brien, Patrick M.

From:

allanjacques@sbcglobal.net

Sent:

Thursday, June 17, 2010 12:12 PM

To: Cc:

O'Brien, Patrick M. Kopetz, Kevin

Subject:

Seaside Regional Center

Attachments:

seaside_sitemap2010updated.jpg; 06.07.2010. Current Photo I.jpg; 06.07.20. Current Photo

II.jpg

Note: Please confirm receipt of this email, and that you are able to read map and photo.

June 16, 2010

Allan N. Jacques

10 Magonk Point Road

Waterford, CT 06385

Allanjacques@sbcqlobal.net

Dear Mr. O'Brien:

I am submitting this correspondence in response to the notice of transfer of the Seaside Regional Center in Waterford, CT, currently posted in the Environmental Monitor. The State of Connecticut has made two attempts to transfer this property, most recently by a new RFP process that was a solicitation for bids.

1) Proposed Subdivision

I have attached a proposed subdivision of the property that could satisfy all parties involved. The state has recently removed several buildings and cleaned up a major portion of the Seaside property. The state has removed all structures from parcel B except a town operated sewerage pump station. The town also retains an easement to the east to Magonk Point and to Shore Road to the north. Parcel A remains an attractive parcel for development even at the full \$8,000,000 price. Parcels B1 and parcel C could be offered for sale or adaptive reuse. Parcel B contains the majority of the environmentally sensitive wetlands on the property and encompasses almost all of the lowlands north of the seawall. The southern end of parcel B is a large basin which sometimes floods in the winter. High tide storm events usually deposit driftwood and water as far as 100 feet north of the seawall. There are some asphalt surfaces in the northern portion of parcel B, but the majority of the area is lightly forested and meadowed.

The previous solicitation for adaptive reuse by state agencies received no interest because of the size of the property and overwhelming responsibility imposed on prospective users to maintain the large historical structures. With this burden lifted I would anticipate that more agencies would come forward to reuse the smaller parcels. Parcel A could be offered to Mr. Steiner or others for condominiums. Minimizing the development to this smaller parcel would be more characteristic of the locale, and

appease neighbors who are concerned with the density of development. Parcel B should be retained by the state or Town of Waterford to guarantee control and access by and for the citizens of the State

2) Removal of all conditions of Sale and No EIE

I am very concerned that the state has removed all conditions of sale in the most recent RFP. This "streamlined" process benefits the developer, disregards the concerns of the neighbors, and shortchanges state residents. I am frustrated that the process has devolved and that over the years our best efforts at compromise and suggestions for alternative uses have been ignored. Now the state has suddenly decided to abandon all conditions of sale. The present assessed value of the property is in excess of \$17,000,000 dollars. That places the fair market value in excess of \$24,000,000. It is, at the very least, irresponsible for the state to dispose of the property for a mere \$8,000,000. The state is being dishonest when it claims it has had no part in determining the use of the property in order to avoid an EIE. The disposition of the property has essentially become a "Fire Sale." When recently asked about the need for an EIE, the managing attorney for the DPW replied: "The State has not imposed any restrictions or obligation to develop Seaside for a specific purpose or use nor does the state intend to impose restrictions on future use. Therefore CEPA does not apply to this proposed sale of Seaside and the DPW will not prepare an Environmental Impact Evaluation." The operative word in this statement is THIS proposed sale. The State most certainly imposed restrictions and obligations in the previous RFP. It is convenient that that old RFP is gone and that the new RFP is structured in such a way as to negate the need for an EIE.

3) Questions

- A. Please list the provisions and conditions of sale that were present in the previous RFP and are absent from the most recent RFP. What specific benefits do the State and its citizens derive from removing these conditions of sale?
- B. Please describe the costs and scope of the recent improvements made to Seaside by the State.
- C. Were these costs been added to the selected bid?
- D. Will the proceeds from the Sale of Seaside go into the general fund or be allocated to the DDS as stipulated by Statute?
- E. Will the Purchase and Sale agreement and the supporting documents from the present negotiations be made public before the sales agreement is finalized? Will the public be allowed comments or input?
- F. Can the state sell the property without adhering to the Coastal Area Management Act?

It is my opinion that the state has decided to expedite the sale process without regard to statue and at the expense of the public. The gain is insignificant in light of the size of the budget and the sale itself is shortsighted. We the people are not well served by this sale process.

Sincerely

Allan N. Jacques

